

C/CAG

CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

*Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park
Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside*

February 18, 2011

To: **DISTRIBUTION LIST** (See Below)

Subject: Call for Projects – Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS)

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) has issued a “call for projects” to Bay Area Congestion Management Agencies (CMA) on February 14, 2011 for development of its long-range Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS 2040). MTC has requested that CMAs to coordinate project submittals for their respective counties. C/CAG is the CMA for San Mateo County.

The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) is a long range planning document blueprint of the region’s transportation system. Projects included in the RTP are for planning purposes only. Projects not listed in the RTP/ SCS cannot compete for Federal, State of California, or regional discretionary funding. In addition, projects that are 100% locally funded and have regional significance must be included in the RTP for air quality conformity purposes.

Changes from last RTP update

In 2008, the California State Legislature passed Senate Bill (SB) 375 (Steinberg). SB 375 requires that the existing framework of regional planning to tie together the regional housing needs allocation (RHNA) and regional transportation planning in an effort to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from motor vehicle trips. It requires that Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) now contain a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) element resulting in an RTP/SCS.

Unlike the previous updates of the RTP, the RTP/SCS must align transportation and land use planning to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Specifically the SCS part adds three new elements to the RTP: (1) a land use component that identifies how the region could house the entire population of the region over the next eight and 25 years; (2) a discussion of resource and farmland areas to be protected; and (3) a demonstration of how the development pattern and the transportation network can work together to reduce GHG emissions.

Project Submittal to C/CAG

In order to meet the MTC deadlines, project sponsors must submit the initial list of projects to C/CAG, attention Jean Higaki at jhigaki@co.sanmateo.ca.us, by **March 15, 2011** using the “2040 RTP Preliminary Project List” as shown in Attachment 1. In addition, project sponsors must complete the MTC detail “on-line” application by **April 8, 2011**. The MTC web-based application will be available on March 1, 2011. For further detail regarding schedule, please refer to Attachment 2.

To assist project sponsors in their selection of projects for submittal, the current RTP 2035 would be a good starting point. Project sponsors should review and update information for projects in the existing RTP 2035 and submit new projects as applicable. **Projects included in the current RTP 2035 will be removed if not re-submitted during this process.** Projects included in the current RTP 2035 can be found at:

http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/2035_plan/FINAL/6_Appendix_1-Projects_Final.pdf (San Mateo County projects are listed on pages 116-118).

General Project Criteria

Project sponsors are encouraged to submit projects which meet one or more of the general criteria listed below, keeping in consideration that projects should support SCS principals promulgated by SB 375:

- Supports the goals and performance targets of the RTP/SCS (see Attachment 3).
- Serves as a regionally significant component of the regional transportation network. A regionally significant transportation project serves regional transportation needs (such as access to and from the area outside of the region, major activity centers in the region, major planned developments such as new retail malls, sports complexes, etc., or transportation terminals as well as most terminals themselves).
- Supports focused growth by serving existing housing and employment centers FOCUS Priority Development Areas
- Derives from an adopted plan, corridor study, or project study report (e.g., community-based transportation plans, countywide transportation plan, regional bicycle plan, climate action plans, etc.).

By April 8, 2011 on-line project application information should be completed. Project sponsors should be prepared to include the following information in their submittal:

- How the project meets the RTP/SCS Goals and Performance Targets. (See Attachment 3)
- Estimated Project cost – Sponsors are to use established guidelines for estimating project cost such as:
 - Federal: National Cooperative Highway Research Program's Guidance for Cost Estimation and Management for Highway Projects During Planning, Programming, and Preconstruction (http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/nchrp/nchrp_w98.pdf)

- State: Caltrans' Project Development Procedures Manual Chapter 20, Project Development Cost Estimates
(http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/oppd/pdpm/chap_pdf/chapt20.pdf)
- Project schedule; including start and completion dates for planning, design and/or construction phases

Further details and guideline from MTC will be posted as information becomes available at:
<http://www.onebayarea.org/cfp.htm>

Eligible Project Sponsors:

Eligible project sponsors must be a public agency such as a city, the county, transit operator, a transportation agency in San Mateo County, or Caltrans. Members of the public are eligible to submit projects, but must secure a public agency sponsor.

Programmatic Categories

Projects that are exempt from regional air quality conformity and do not add capacity or expand the transportation network, may be grouped into broader programmatic categories rather than submitting them as individual projects for consideration in the RTP/SCS. C/CAG will submit the following programmatic categories of projects for the entire County of San Mateo:

- Bicycle and pedestrian facilities and enhancement
- Lifeline transportation
- Local road safety
- Highway safety
- Local streets and roads O&M
- Non-capacity increasing local road intersection modifications and channelization
- Intelligent transportation system (ITS)
- Shuttles
- TLC/Streetscape
- Transportation Oriented Development (TOD)
- Transportation environmental enhancements
- Non-capacity increasing traffic operation improvements

Anticipated Future Steps:

Starting in May 2011, MTC will select projects to undergo project-level performance evaluations (see Attachment 4). The results of the project performance assessment will inform the upcoming detailed alternatives analysis and investment trade-off discussions, ultimately leading to a preferred RTP/SCS early next year with adoption occurring a year later.

Deadlines


It is extremely important to meet the submittal deadlines.

- Deadline for preliminary project information to be included in the RTP/SCS is due on **March 15, 2011.**
- Deadline for completing input of the on-line application is **April 8, 2011.**

Please notify C/CAG staff Jean Higaki at jhigaki@co.sanmateo.ca.us or Sandy Wong at Slwong@co.sanmateo.ca.us when your on-line project application information is complete and submitted to MTC. Failure to submit an application will be viewed as the sponsor having no further interest in the project during the upcoming RTP/ SCS period.

If you have any questions about this process please contact Jean Higaki at (650) 599-1462 jhigaki@co.sanmateo.ca.us or Sandy Wong at (650) 599-1409 Slwong@co.sanmateo.ca.us.

Sincerely,



Richard Napier
Executive Director of C/CAG

DISTRIBUTION LIST:

County of San Mateo — Jim Porter, Director of Public Works
Atherton — Duncan Jones, Director of Public Works
Belmont — Leticia Alvarez,, Acting Director of Public Works
Brisbane — Randy Breault, Director of Public Works
Burlingame — Syed Murturza, Director of Public Works
Colma — Rick Mao, Director of Public Works
Daly City — John Fuller, Director of Public Works
East Palo Alto — Anthony Docto, Director of Public Works
Foster City — Ramon Towne, Director of Public Works
Half Moon Bay — Mo Sharma, Director of Public Works
Hillsborough — Martha DeBry, Director of Public Works
Menlo Park — Kent Steffens, Director of Public Works
Millbrae — Ron Popp, Director of Public Works
Pacifica — Van Ocampo, Director of Public Works
Portola Valley — Howard Young, Director of Public Works
Redwood City — Chu Chang, Director of Public Works
San Bruno — Klara Fabry, Director of Public Works
San Carlos — Robert Weil, Director of Public Works

San Mateo — Larry Patterson, Director of Public Works
South San Francisco — Ray Razavi, City Engineer
Woodside — Paul Nagengast, Director of Public Works
SamTrans — April Chan, Director of Budgets and Grants
CalTrain — Marian Lee, Executive Officer of Planning and Development
SMCTA — Joe Hurley, Director of the Transportation Authority Program
Caltrans — Lee Taubeneck, Deputy Director of Planning
Cathleen Baker — MTC Policy Advisory Council, Member
Richard Hedges — MTC Policy Advisory Council, Member
Other Interested Parties

cc:

C/CAG, CMEQ, BPAC, and CMP TAC Members
County of San Mateo — David Bosch, County Manager
Atherton — John Danielson, City Manager
Belmont — Greg Scoles, , City Manager
Brisbane — Clayton Holstein, City Manager
Burlingame — James Nantell, City Manager
Colma — Laura Allen, City Manager
Daly City — Pat Martel, City Manager
East Palo Alto — ML Gordon, City Manager
Foster City — Jim Hardy, City Manager
Half Moon Bay — Laura Snideman, City Manager
Hillsborough — Tony Constantouros, City Manager
Menlo Park — Glen Rojas, City Manager
Millbrae — Marcia Raines, City Manager
Pacifica — Steve Rhodes, City Manager
Portola Valley — Angela Howard, City Manager
Redwood City — Peter Ingram, City Manager
San Bruno — Connie Jackson, City Manager
San Carlos — Jeff Maltbie, City Manager
San Mateo — Susan Loftus, City Manager
South San Francisco — Barry Nagel, City Manager
Woodside — Susan George, City Manager

Attachments:

1. Spreadsheet for Required Preliminary Project List Information
2. C/CAG RTP Call For Projects Schedule
3. MTC Goals and Performance Targets
4. MTC Draft Transportation Project Performance Assessment Methodology

Attachment 1

Attachment 1 RTP Preliminary Project List
2/18/2011

C/CAG RTP Call For Projects Schedule

The following “call for projects” schedule was developed by MTC and augmented with C/CAG processes (shaded tasks).

Schedule Task	Date
Review and Solicit Input on Draft Call for Projects Guidance	MTC PTAC: January 31, 2011 Regional RAWG: February 1, 2011 MTC Policy Advisory Council: February 9, 2011
MTC Planning Committee for Information	February 9, 2011
MTC Issues Call for Projects Guidance Letter to CMAs	February 10, 2011
C/CAG staff coordination meeting with SMCTA/SamTrans/JBP	February 10, 2011
CMP TAC – Process Review	February 17, 2011
C/CAG issues a call for projects to all identified project sponsors	February 18, 2011
CMEQ – Process Review	February 28, 2011
Open Web-Based Project Application Form for Use by CMAs/ Project Sponsors	March 1, 2011
Project Sponsor submits initial project list to C/CAG	March 15, 2011
C/CAG staff develops preliminary draft list of projects based on sponsor submittals	March 16, 2011
CMP TAC – Review of draft list	March 17, 2011
CMEQ – Review of the draft list	March 28, 2011
Project Sponsors to complete web based application	April 8, 2011
C/CAG Board – Review of the draft list	April 14, 2011
CMP TAC –Review of the Final List	April 21, 2011
CMEQ –Review of the Final List	April 25, 2011
Project Submittals Due to MTC	April 29, 2011
C/CAG Board –Approval of the Final List (C/CAG will submit a draft list and request an extension from MTC for Board approved final list.)	May 12, 2011
MTC Conducts Project-Level Performance Assessment	May – July 2011

~~Attachment A.1~~
RTP/SCS Goals and Performance Targets

Goal	Performance Target (from 2005 levels unless noted)
<p><u>Climate Protection</u> Dealing effectively with the challenge of climate change involves communities far beyond the shores of San Francisco Bay. Indeed, Senate Bill 375 requires metropolitan areas throughout California to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from cars and trucks. Furthermore, our region must safeguard the shoreline due to sea-level rise through adaption strategies. By combining aggressive policies with innovative technologies, the Bay Area can act as a model for other regions around the state and nationwide.</p>	<p>Reduce per-capita CO₂ emissions from cars and light-duty trucks by 15%</p>
<p><u>Adequate Housing</u> A diverse and sufficient housing supply is essential to maximize livability for all Bay Area residents. The region aspires not only to ensure affordability and supply of housing for peoples of all income levels and in all nine counties, but also to reduce the concentration of poverty in low-income communities of concern.</p>	<p>House 100% of the region's projected 25-year growth by income level (very-low, low, moderate, above-moderate) without displacing current low-income resident</p>
<p><u>Healthy & Safe Communities</u> Promoting healthy and safe communities includes improving air quality, reducing collisions and encouraging more bicycle and pedestrian travel. While policy choices by regional agencies can help influence land-use decisions and the operation and design of transportation infrastructure, local governments have the biggest role to play. Cities' and counties' land-use authority directly shapes the development patterns that guide individuals' travel choices.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reduce premature deaths from exposure to particular emissions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce premature deaths from exposure to fine particulates (PM2.5) by 10% • Reduce coarse particulate emissions (PM10) by 30% • Achieve greater reductions in highly impacted areas Associated Indicators <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incidence of asthma attributable to particulate emissions • Diesel particulate emissions ○ Reduce by 50% the number of injuries and fatalities from all collisions (including bike and pedestrian) ○ Increase the average time walking or biking per person per day for transportation by 60% (for an average of 15 minutes per person per day)
<p><u>Open Space & Agricultural Preservation</u> Limiting urban sprawl will help preserve productive agricultural lands and prime natural habitat, in addition to maintaining public access to shorelines, mountains, lakes and rivers. As open space and farmlands are essential to the Bay Area's quality of life, the region</p>	<p>Direct all non-agricultural development within the urban footprint (existing urban development and urban growth boundaries)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scenarios will be compared to 2010 urban footprint

Goal	Performance Target (from 2005 levels unless noted)
should focus growth in existing urban areas rather than pursue additional development in outlying areas.	for analytical purposes only
<p><u>Equitable Access</u> A high quality of life is not a privilege reserved only for the wealthy. Regional agencies must work to ensure that high-quality housing is available for people of all incomes; that essential destinations may be reached at a minimal cost of time or money; that mobility options are available not only to those who can transport themselves but also to our growing populations of senior and disabled residents; that the benefits and burdens alike of transportation investment are evenly distributed; and that air pollution, water pollution or noise pollution are not disproportionately concentrated in low-income neighborhoods.</p>	Decrease by 10% the share of low-income and lower-middle income residents' household income consumed by transportation and housing
<p><u>Economic Vitality</u> A strong economy is imperative to ensure continued quality of life for all Bay Area residents. This includes a healthy climate for business and growth, and plentiful employment opportunities for individuals of all skill levels and industries. Savvy transportation and land-use policies in pursuit of this goal will not only reduce travel times but also expand choices, cut total costs, improve accessibility, and boost reliability.</p>	Increase gross regional product (GRP) by 87% – an average of 2.1% per year (in current dollars)
<p><u>Transportation System Effectiveness</u> Maximizing the efficiency of the transportation system requires preserving existing assets in a state of good repair as well as leveraging assets that are not fully utilized and making targeted, cost-effective improvements. Continued maintenance is necessary to protect safety, minimize vehicle damage, support infill development in existing urban areas and promote economic growth regionwide.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Decrease average per-trip travel time by 10% for non-auto modes ○ Decrease automobile vehicle miles traveled per capita by 10% ○ Maintain the transportation system in a state of good repair: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase local road pavement condition index (PCI) to 75 or better • Decrease distressed lane-miles of state highways to less than 10% of total lane-miles • Reduce average transit asset age to 50% of useful life
<p><u>Infrastructure Security</u> The potential for damage from natural or manmade disasters is a threat to the security of Bay Area infrastructure. To preserve the region's economic vitality and quality of life, Bay Area government officials — in cooperation with federal and state agencies — must work to prevent damage to infrastructure systems and to minimize the potential impacts of any future disasters. Funding priorities must reflect the need to ensure infrastructure security and to avoid any preventable loss of life.</p>	

~~Attachment A.3~~ – MTC's Draft Transportation Project Performance Assessment Methodology

	Transportation 2035	SCS/RTP Approach – Initial Thoughts
Goals Assessment (largely qualitative)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All projects (700+) assessed, grouped into 13 project type How well projects address each goal/number of goals addressed Conducted by panel of MTC staff and stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as for Transportation 2035 – but reflecting new goals/targets and with added emphasis on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> support for focused growth statutory goals to reduce carbon dioxide and accommodate future housing demand For larger projects, use quantitative information where available, such as projected CO2 and particulate emissions reduction
Benefit-Cost Assessment (quantitative)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 60 large-scale uncommitted projects as well as uncommitted regional programs MTC model analysis <ol style="list-style-type: none"> B/C ratio in 2035 including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delay CO2 PM10 and PM2.5 Injuries & fatalities Direct user costs (vehicle operating/ownership) Cost savings for on-time maintenance Cost per reduction on CO2 Cost per reduction in VMT Cost per low-income household served by new transit <p>Goals not reflected in B/C are captured through the qualitative assessment</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same types of projects but potentially more (perhaps 100) - subject to final policy on committed projects MTC model analysis <ol style="list-style-type: none"> B/C ratio - over 25 yrs instead of horizon year (if time allows) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Travel time (see notes below) CO2 PM10 and PM2.5 Health costs associated with changes in active transportation levels Injuries & fatalities Direct user costs (vehicle operating/ownership) Cost savings for on-time maintenance <p>Goals not reflected in B/C are captured through the goals assessment in a qualitative fashion</p>
Synthesis & Use of Information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bubble chart mapping B/C and number of goals addressed Sponsors “justify” projects with low-B/C before inclusion in the draft plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bubble chart mapping B/C and number of goals addressed Sponsors must “justify” projects with <ol style="list-style-type: none"> low B/C or meeting few goals increase in CO2 emissions that do not support draft land use
Considerations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Four quantitative measures was information overload for the decision makers; prefer to have a single quantitative result 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider approaches to address to concern that current B/C model is dominated by travel time <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sensitivity tests of impact of travel time on relative ratings of projects Review emerging practices for travel time valuation (e.g., discounting small time savings, different values of time based on trip purpose, value of reliability) Assess significance of B/C results for each project